REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-25 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 12-15, 18, 19, 21, 24, and 25 have been amended by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 6 was objected to; Claims 1-11, 13-17, 19-23, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Bilbrey (U.S. Patent No. 6,020,931) in view of Chen (U.S. Patent No. 6,556,704); and Claims 12, 18, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Bilbrey, Chen, and Prakash (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0131495).

Regarding the objection to Claim 6, this claim has been amended to depend from Claim 5. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 12-15, 18, 19, 21, 24, and 25 have been amended to correct minor informalities. Independent Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly recite that first and second contents are captured from an image and a modified image, respectively, displayed on a display. Independent Claims 7, 13, 19, and 25 have been amended to more clearly recite that an active testing of a portion of a displayed image is based on first and second versions of the displayed image and the second version of the displayed imaged is captured by an image capture device after being displayed on a

display. The claim amendments find support in Figures 9A-C and their corresponding description in the specification. No new matter has been added.

Briefly recapitulating, amended Claim 1 is directed to a method for displaying an occlusion of a display on the display. The method includes, inter alia, generating an image on the display, capturing first contents from the image displayed on the display with an image capture device, analyzing the first contents to identify a first set of potentially occluded pixels, changing a value of the first set of potentially occluded pixels to generate a modified image that is displayed on the display, and capturing second contents, from the modified image displayed on the display, with the image capture device.

As disclosed in the specification, for example, in paragraph [0033], the claimed method advantageously distinguishes between an occlusion having a same color as the background of the display by capturing the first and second contents from the image and modified image displayed on the display.

Turning to the applied art, Bilbrey discloses a computer image processing method that generates a depth map for producing a foreground depth mask for 2D/3D image editing. More specifically, with reference to Figure 53 on which the outstanding Office Action relies, Bilbrey shows that a foreground object of a first color 3330, a background object of a second color 3332, and other objects also visible in a frame 3340 are captured by cameras 3310 and 3312. The data from the cameras 3310 and 3312 is supplied to a first key generator 3380 and a second key generator 3382 that

produce first and second color key signals. These signals are sent to a compositing block 3370. Based on these signals and other signals received from compositing units 3350 and 3352, a compositing block 3370 outputs a signal 3390. The signal 3390 is indicative of a depth of the foreground object, the background object and other objects captured by cameras 3310 and 3312.

Bilbrey specifically discloses at column 37, lines 12-25, that images 3381 and 3383 correspond to the output signals from the first key generator 3380 and the second key generator 3382, respectively. Images 3381 and 3383 are shown in Figure 53. However, these images are not displayed on a display to be captured by any of cameras 3310 and 3312. Images 3381 and 3383 are used only for aiding the reader to understand how the system shown in Figure 53 operates and their corresponding signals are used by the system. In other words, only image 3335 is shown on a display, but not images 3381 and 3383. Furthermore, neither image 3335 nor images 3381 and 3383 are displayed such that features of those images are captured by cameras 3310 or 3312.

On the contrary, amended Claim 1 recites that first and second contents are captured "from the image displayed on said display" and "from said modified image displayed on said display."

Therefore, Bilbrey does not teach or suggest capturing first contents of the image displayed on the display with an image capture device, and capturing second contents

of the modified image displayed on the display with the same image capture device as required by amended Claim 1.

In addition, as recognized by the outstanding Office Action on page 3, first full paragraph, "Bilbrey does not disclose selectively confirming said first set potentially occluded pixels and generating said confirming occluded pixel." The outstanding Office Action relies on Chen for teaching this feature. However, Chen does not overcome the deficiencies of Bilbrey discussed above with regard to independent Claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Bilbrey and Chen.

Amended Claim 7 is directed to a method for processing a displayed image that includes, passively testing a first version of an image and actively testing a portion of the image. The passively testing step tests the first version of the displayed image captured by an image capture device to determine if a portion of the displayed image is blocked from the image capture device. The actively testing step tests the portion of the displayed image based on the first version of the displayed image and a second version of the displayed image to confirm whether the portion of the displayed image is blocked from the image capture device. The second version of the displayed image is captured by the image capture device after being displayed on the display. Independent Claims 13, 19, and 25 have been amended in a manner similar to that of Claim 7.

As discussed above, <u>Bilbrey</u> does not teach or suggest displaying an image, modifying that image, displaying the modified image, and capturing the modified image with an image capture device as required by amended Claims 7, 13, 19, and 25.

The outstanding Office Action asserts that <u>Chen</u> discloses actively testing a portion of a top image shown in Figure 1 and using a bottom image, also shown in Figure 1, for confirming occluded pixels in the top image.

<u>Chen</u> shows in Figure 1 that a first image 13b of a set of objects is taken with a top camera 11b and a second image of the same set of objects is taken with a bottom camera 11a and these two images are used to form a depth image 10. However, neither the first image 13b nor the second image 13a are displayed and then captured by cameras 11b and 11a. Cameras 11a and 11b are used in <u>Chen</u> for generating images 13a and 13b and not for capturing these images. On the contrary, amended Claims 7, 13, 19, and 25 recite that a ***first version of the displayed image*** is captured by an image capture device for the passive test, and ***a second version of the displayed image*** is captured by the image capture device for the active test.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 7, 13, 19, and 25 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over <u>Bilbrey</u> and <u>Chen</u>, either alone or in combination.

Regarding dependent Claims 12, 18, and 24, <u>Prakash</u> does not cure the deficiencies of <u>Bilbrey</u> and <u>Chen</u> discussed above with regard to independent Claims 1, 7, 13, 19, and 25, which are believed to be in condition for allowance. Thus, it is

respectfully submitted that dependent Claims 12, 18, and 24 are also in condition for allowance.

All of the objections and rejections raised in the outstanding Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this response or the application in general, she or he is invited to contact the undersigned at (540) 361-2601.

Respectfully submitted,

POTOMAC PATENT GROUP PLLC

By: /Remus F. Fetea/
        Remus F. Fetea, Ph.D
        Registration No. 59,140

Date: January 10, 2008

Potomac Patent Group PLLC
P.O. Box 270
Fredericksburg, VA 22404
(540) 361-1863